DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 253 579 TM 850 125

AUTHOR Stavros, Denny
TITLE Report on the Results of the Survey of Northwestern High School Staff in May, 1984, and a Comparison of Survey Results for the Last Two Years. High School Improvement Project.
INSTITUTION Detroit Public Schools, MI. Office of Instructional Improvement.
PUB DATE Nov 84
NOTE 34p.; For related documents, see ED 250 400, ED 230 654, and ED 230 663.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS High Schools; *Institutional Evaluation; *Longitudinal Studies; Questionnaires; Responses; *School Effectiveness; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Detroit Public Schools MI

ABSTRACT

Two surveys form the major components of the High School Improvement Project at Northwestern High School, Detroit. One is a survey of pupil behaviors, attitudes, and opinions; the other is a survey of staff behaviors, attitudes, and opinions. The present report brings together the findings for the 1984 staff survey and presents a comparison of staff responses for the last two years. This report is divided into five parts: three narrative sections and two appendices. The first narrative section presents staff responses aggregated by seven school effectiveness categories: safe and orderly environment, clear school mission, instructional leadership, high expectations, opportunity to learn and student time-on-task, frequent monitoring of student progress, and home-school relations. The second narrative section seeks to identify the school's strengths and weaknesses where there was a lack of consensus among respondents. The third narrative section presents the results from comparing 1984 staff responses with 1983 staff responses for each statement. The response frequencies, in percents, from the 1984 survey, are presented in Appendix A. In Appendix B, mean scores from the two surveys, t-values, and significance levels are displayed. (BW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED253579

REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF THE SURVEY OF NORTHWESTERN HIGH SCHOOL STAFF IN MAY, 1984, AND A COMPARISON OF SURVEY RESULTS FOR THE LAST TWO YEARS

High School Improvement Project

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Stavros

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Denny Stavros, Ph.D.
General Evaluation Unit
Evaluation and Testing Department
Office of Instructional Improvement
Detroit Public Schools

November 1984

REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF THE SURVEY OF NORTHWESTERN HIGH SCHOOL STAFF IN MAY, 1984, AND A COMPARISON OF SURVEY RESULTS FOR THE LAST TWO YEARS

Introduction

Two surveys have been conducted annually at Northwestern High School. These form the major components of the High School Improvement Project evaluation. One has been a survey of pupil behaviors, attitudes and opinions, and the other, a survey of staff behaviors, attitudes and opinions. The findings from the student surveys have been reported in three annual reports. The present report brings together the findings for the 1984 staff survey and, in a separate section, presents a comparison of staff responses for the last two years.

The research instrument used in the last two staff surveys has been the second revised edition of the School Effectiveness Questionnaire (July, 1982).[1] The instrument was originally developed at the Connecticut State Department of Education and served as a component of that agency's School Effectiveness Assessment Process. The Connecticut instrument provides for an assessment of staff perceptions of school and instructional effectiveness behaviors and activities vis-a-vis seven characteristics. According to William J. Gauthier, Connecticut Department of Education, these seven characteristics emerged

> ....from the literature on teacher and classroom instruction and school effectiveness that appear[ed] to be correlated with student achievement.[2]

---

[1]The revisions were completed by Denny Stavros and JoAnne E. Moore of the General Evaluation Unit, Detroit Public Schools.

[2]William J. Gauthier, "The Connecticut School Improvement Project," in The Connecticut School Effectiveness Project, Development and Assessment, Connecticut State Department of Education, Hartford, December, 1981, p. 4.

The seven characteristics[1] are: safe and orderly environment, clear school mission, instructional leadership, high expectations, opportunity to learn and student time-on-task, frequent monitoring of student progress, and home-school relations.

Revisions of the Connecticut instrument represent changes in its content to more accurately fit the current instructional program in Detroit's high schools. A major part of the revisions was also a restructuring of an instrument that was geared to the elementary school level. However, the instrument's seven characteristics, as well as its factor structure, were kept intact through the two revisions. The first revision resulted in an instrument with 80 statements. An abbreviated version containing 46 of the 80 statements was used in the staff survey at Northwestern high school in 1982. An additional revision was undertaken, in part, because of its length, and, in part, because the results of the first survey reflected weaknesses in a number of statements.

The second revised edition of the School Effectiveness Questionnaire, used since 1982, has a total of 48 statements. Comparisons of the 1982 Northwestern high school staff responses with those made in the last two surveys are thus precluded, save for the responses to a limited number of statements that appeared unaltered on both instruments. The results of such comparisons that were possible are not presented in this report.

In 1984, 86 usable questionnaires were returned, as compared to 74 in 1983. Fourth Friday staff counts were 92 and 93, respectively. In 1982, a much smaller share of the staff membership participated in the survey; 39

---

[1] A full descriptive statement of each characteristic is given in the Appendix.

completed instruments were used for the first evaluation report. The Fourth Friday staff count (October, 1982) was 98.

This report is divided into two parts: three narrative sections and two appendices. The first narrative section presents staff responses aggregated by school effectiveness categories with two units of analysis: the mean of the item scores and their rank-order (1984 survey) and the mean of the percents responding favorably and their rank-order (1984 and 1983 surveys). The second narrative section, as the first, seeks to identify the school's strengths and its weaknesses, as well as those areas in the school's structure and functioning where there was a lack of consensus among respondents. That is to say, where a rather higher percentage answered, 'Undecided,' or where roughly equal proportions of the respondents agreed and disagreed. For discussion purposes, the five point scale used on the instrument was collapsed to three. Thus, the percents answering 'Strongly Disagree' and 'Disagree' are combined and presented as a single percent and labelled 'Disagree.' At the opposite side of the scale, the percent answering 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree' are combined and labelled 'Agree.' Percents answering 'Undecided' were left intact. The third narrative section presents the results from comparing 1984 staff responses with 1983 staff responses for each statement using the t-test to test for differences between mean scores.

The response frequencies, in percents, from the 1984 survey, are presented in Appendix A. The questions and response percents in tabular displays are grouped according to school effectiveness characteristic. A similar format is followed in Appendix B where mean scores from the two surveys, t-values, and significance levels are displayed.

School Effectiveness Categories

Table 1 presents the rankings of school effectiveness categories on the basis of mean scores, i.e., means of the item scores per category, for the 1984 survey, and mean percents, i.e., means of the percents responding favorably--usually agreeing--per category, for the 1984 and 1983 surveys. Instructional leadership was subdivided into two categories: department head leadership and principal leadership.

In comparing ranks of item-score means with the ranks of means of percents responding favorably or agreeing with statements from the 1984 survey results, we find that five of the eight school effectiveness categories occupied the same rank position in both rankings. Of the three remaining categories, safe and orderly environment ranked fifth on the percents agreeing ranking and seventh on the mean scores ranking.

In 1984, an average of 54 percent of the staff were in agreement with statements relating to the instructional leadership of department heads. This was the highest ranking of all school effectiveness categories. For the other set of instructional leadership statements, those focusing on the principal's behavior, the average favorable response was 45 percent. Within the rank-order of school effectiveness categories, the principal's instructional leadership evaluation placed sixth.

The two sets of statements bearing directly on instructional behavior, frequent monitoring of student progress and opportunity to learn/student time-on-task ranked second and third. Their average favorable response percents were 51 and 50. Ranking fourth was home-school relations with an average favorable response percent of 49.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS, MEANS OF THE ITEM SCORES AND THEIR RANKINGS (1984), MEANS OF THE PERCENTS RESPONDING FAVORABLY* AND THEIR RANKINGS (1983, 1984), PER SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS CATEGORIES

School Effectiveness Categories	Number Of Items Per Category	1984 Survey				1983 Survey	
		Means Of The Item Scores	Rank	Means Of The Percents Responding Favorably	Rank	Means Of The Percents Responding Favorably	Rank
Safe and Orderly Environment	8	2.92	7	45.75%	5	40.50%	7
Clear School Mission	3	3.00	6	42.33	7	44.67	5
Instructional Leadership:							
Principal	8**	3.03	5	44.63	6	50.63	4
Department Head	7**	3.33	1	53.86	1	61.00	1
High Expectations	5	2.68	8	30.80	8	29.20	8
Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-On-Task	5	3.22	3	50.00	3	54.60	3
Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress	5	3.31	2	51.00	2	55.60	2
Home-School Relations	7	3.06	4	48.57	4	41.71	6

*The percents responding favorably were derived by adding the percents answering 'Strongly Agree' and 'Agree' on all but four items. On items numbered 2, 9, 11, and 31, where the statement was expressed in the negative, percents answering 'Strongly Disagree' and 'Disagree' were counted as favorable responses.

**The combined Department Head and Principal instructional leadership responses produced a mean of 3.17 for item scores and a mean of 48.93% for favorable percents.

Ranking fifth and sixth, safe and orderly environment and instructional leadership of the principal were separated by one percentage point in average percents responding favorably.

Occupying the next-to-last position in the rank-order hierarchy was clear school mission with a favorable response percent average of 42.

The school effectiveness category receiving the least favorable evaluation by the staff at Northwestern high school in 1984 was high expectations. On average, less than one-third of the staff shared a positive attitude in the ability of students to attain mastery of basic skills, let alone complete high school.

When 1984 average percents of favorable responses are compared with those of 1983, we find that for five of the eight school effectiveness categories, there was a decrease in the average percents and, of course, with the three remaining categories, there was an increase. Even with declining percents, the three top ranking categories maintained their status in 1984. At the opposite end of the rankings, high expectations improved by two percentage points in 1984 over 1983, but still ranked last.

Shifts in both rank and percents occured for the following school effectiveness categories:

> instructional leadership of the principal decreased by 6 percentage points and dropped from a rank of 4th in 1983 to a rank of 6th in 1984;
>
> safe and orderly environment increased by 5 percentage points and rose from a rank of 7th to 5th;
>
> home-school relations increased by 7 percentage points and rose from a rank of 6th to 4th between the two surveys; and
>
> clear school mission decreased by 2 percentage points and declined from fifth position to seventh position from 1983 to 1984.

The range of the means of the percents answering favorably in 1983 was 31.8 percentage points with a high of 61.0 in contrast to a narrowing in the range and degree of average favorable opinions in 1984--range of 23.1 percentage points with a high of 53.4.

Results of the 1984 Survey

Safe and Orderly Environment

The overwhelming majority of staff gave high marks for Northwestern's physical appearance and cleanliness. However, close to two-thirds felt that Northwestern was neither a safe nor a secure place in which to work. In fact, eight out of ten of the staff were of the opinion that both students and staff viewed security as a school issue.

Although two-thirds were of the opinion that discipline was an issue at Northwestern, there was a lack of consensus with regard to student adherence to school rules--half were in disagreement and almost half were in agreement.

On the issue of student eagerness and enthusiasm about learning, two-thirds felt that most students were neither eager nor enthusiastic.

Equal proportions of the staff agreed and disagreed with the assertion that a positive feeling permeated the school.

Clear School Mission

There was majority agreement on but one of the three statements in this grouping. Approximately two-thirds agreed that reteaching and specific skill remediation were important parts of the teaching process at Northwestern. Only a third accepted the assertion that behind most important decisions a written statement of purpose functioned as a driving force. Half of the staff

rejected this statement. An even smaller proportion, just over one-fourth, concurred with the statement the High School Proficiency test results were used to program students into appropriate classes at Northwestern. One-fourth was undecided and almost half of the staff disagreed.

Instructional Leadership--The Department Head

Four items outlining stages in the formal classroom observation process, i.e., department heads observing the instructional practices of teachers in their respective departments, were interspersed throughout the survey instrument. When taken in their temporal sequence, their response percentages revealed less than an ideal pattern of agreement. Over half of the staff agreed that their department head made several formal classroom observations each year, but almost a third disagreed. Fourteen percent were undecided. Equal proportions (two-fifths) agreed and disagreed with the statement that prior to the classroom observation, the teacher and department head meet to discuss what would be observed. One-fifth was uncer ain about such meetings. However, over half of the staff was in agreement that a post-observation conference usually followed a formal observation. One-fourth disagreed and 16 percent were undecided. Finally, two-fifths reported than an instructional improvement plan usually resulted from the post-observation conference. One-third disagreed and one-fourth was undecided.

A higher proportion (46 percent) of the staff was in agreement that improved instructional practices often resulted from discussions with department heads. Still, one-third disagreed and approximately one-fourth was undecided.

Apart from considerations of the results for improved instructional practices, the department head was viewed as a source to be consulted for instructional concerns and problems. Three-fifths of the staff were in agreement. Between one-fourth and one-third disagreed and one-tenth was uncertain.

The instructional leadership tasks performed by the department heads that received the highest proportion of agreement (74 percent) were those requiring teachers to keep lesson plans and the department head's regular review of such plans. Less than one-fifth disagreed; one-tenth was undecided.

Instructional Leadership--The Principal

Four statements addressed the principal's instructional leadership. On all but one, the proportion disagreeing with the statement exceeded the proportion agreeing. Fifty-six percent did not view the principal as an important instructional resource person at Northwestern. One-third did; ten percent were uncertain. Half of the staff rejected the statement that the principal led frequent formal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement. Twenty-one percent were uncertain and 30 percent agreed. A decidedly unambiguous lack of consensus was apparent in the response pattern to the characterization of the principal as the locus of clear, strong, centralized instructional leadership: 42 percent disagreed, 38 percent agreed, and 20 percent were uncertain. It was only where the principal was characterized as accessible to discuss instructional matters did a majority agree (56 percent). Even with this, a third disagreed and one-tenth was uncertain.

The view that the principal was accessible to persons other than for instructional matters is suggested by the responses to an additional statement

in this grouping. Almost three-fifths of the Northwestern staff rejected the assertion that the principal rarely makes informal contacts with students and teachers around the school. Almost a third accepted the statement and 12 percent were uncertain. Yet, the idea that the principal is highly visible throughout the school was acceptable to only two-fifths of the staff. Just over half rejected this idea and six percent were uncertain.

The staff was divided in its assessment of the principal's efforts toward staff development. Forty-six percent were in disagreement with the statement that the principal was very active in securing resources, arranging opportunities, and promoting staff development activities for the faculty. Forty-four percent were in agreement; ten percent were uncertain.

A higher proportion of affirmative responses was registered to the statement that most problems facing Northwestern could be solved by both principal and staff without much outside help (three-fifths). However, approximately two-fifths did not agree. Only four percent were uncertain.

High Expectations

On none of the five high expectation statements did the majority of the staff respond in consonance with the theory and practice of effective schools research. Almost three-fourths of the respondents agreed that low-achieving students presented more discipline problems than other students. Three-fifths disagreed with the prediction that most of the present ninth graders at Northwestern could be expected to complete high school. Just over one-fourth did not entertain such an expectation. Almost half of the staff rejected the idea that Northwestern high school teachers believed they were responsible for all students mastering all basic skills at each grade level. Over one-third did accept the idea, but 17 percent were uncertain.

Low-achieving students did not usually answer questions as often as other students in the classrooms of 54 percent of the staff. For 27 percent, low-achieving students did. One-fifth of the staff was uncertain.

The staff also was undecided as to whether teachers believed that every student at Northwestern could master basic skills as a direct result of the instructional program. Forty-six percent disagreed; 42 percent agreed. Twelve percent were uncertain.

Opportunity To Learn and Student Time-On-Task

The majority of the staff answered positively on three of the five statements measuring opportunity to learn and student time-on-task. Seventy-one percent affirmed that typically daily lesson plans at Northwestern included teacher presentation, student practice, specific feedback, and student performance evaluation. Of those not in agreement, 13 percent disagreed, and 17 percent were uncertain.

Fifty-six percent of the staff were in agreement with the statement that teachers plan assignments so that students will be highly successful during the practice work that follows direct instruction. Almost one-third, however, was uncertain of this and 14 percent disagreed.

Just over half accepted the idea that the class atmosphere was very conducive to learning for all students. One-third rejected this idea and half of that proportion was undecided.

Notwithstanding a reported positive classroom atmosphere, the same proportion--over half of the staff--disagreed with the statement that there were few interruptions during class time. Only one-third supported the statement and 11 percent were undecided.

There was an apparent lack of consensus, as well as perhaps a lack of information, on the part of the staff in their responses to the statement that students work independently on seatwork for the majority of the allocated time during basic skills instruction. Approximately one-third either agreed, disagreed or was uncertain.

Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

Close to two-thirds of the staff affirmed the presence of systematic, regular assessment of students' basic skills in most of the classrooms at Northwestern high school. One-fifth believed the opposite and 16 percent were undecided.

Close to three-fifths also agreed that multiple assessment methods were used to assess student progress in basic skills. Among the methods used were criterion-referenced tests, work samples, and mastery check lists. But, one-fourth of the staff was undecided and another one-fourth disagreed. However, less than half of the staff (44 percent) agreed with the statement that criterion-referenced tests were used throughout the school to assess basic skills. As many as one-third expressed uncertainty and one-fourth was in disagreement.

Staff opinions regarding the standardized testing program were a reverse of those regarding the use of criterion-referenced tests. Only a third agreed that the standardized testing program was an accurate and valid measure of the basic skills curriculum at Northwestern, but almost half (46 percent) disagreed. Just over one-fifth were undecided.

The majority felt that teachers did give specific feedback to students on daily assignments (60 percent); ten percent were in disagreement and almost one-third were undecided.

Home-School Relations

A rather inconsistent pattern of both positive and negative school effectiveness behaviors, relative to home-school relations, emerged from the staff responses.

While close to three-fourths of staff felt that both teachers and parents were aware of the homework policy at Northwestern, almost three-fourths disagreed with the statement that almost all students complete assigned homework before coming to school.

Three-fourths of the staff agreed that there was a focus on student achievement and basic skills mastery during parent-teacher conferences, but only about half of the staff agreed that specific plans for home/school cooperation, aimed at improving student classroom achievement, resulted from such conferences. Two-fifths disagreed.

Beyond the conference and report cards, several other forms of communication were used by teachers to inform parents of student progress. Seventy percent of the staff believed this to be true; one-fifth disagreed.

Half of the staff did not believe that there was an active parent-school group involving many parents at Northwestern. Almost two-fifths were of the opinion there was such a group.

To the statement, "Most parents would rate this school as superior," only 20 percent agreed. Seventy-two percent disagreed.

A Comparison of Staff Responses For the Last Two Years

1983 and 1984

To test for statistically significant differences in the staff responses for the last two years, t-tests were computed using 1983 and 1984 mean scores per questionnaire statement. The results, along with the questionnaire statements and mean scores, are displayed in Appendix B.

For 27 of the 48 statements (56 percent) comprising the School Effectiveness Questionnaire, there was an improvement. This may be observed from the larger mean scores in 1984 over those for 1983. For the remaining 44 percent, there were no improvements. However, in many instances, the differences were, indeed, slight.

More importantly, for only one t-test was the result statistically significant at or below the .05 level. Almost three-fourths in 1984, in contrast to two-fifths in 1983, agreed that teachers and parents were aware of the homework policy at Northwestern high school.[1]

---

[1] Mean scores were 3.62 (1984); 2.86 (1983).

APPENDIX A

A. Safe and Orderly Environment

There is an orderly, purposeful atmosphere which is free from the threat of physical harm. However, the atmosphere is not oppressive and is conducive to teaching and learning.

Item No.	Statement	Percents of Responses				
		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.	This school is a safe and secure place to work	14%	49%	8%	23%	6%
8.	Most students in this school are eager and enthusiastic about learning	23	44	5	23	5
9.	The physical condition of this school building is, generally, unpleasant and unkempt	41	50	1	7	1
16.	Students in this school abide by school rules	12	37	6	41	4
21.	Generally, discipline is not an issue in this school	29	38	7	20	6
34.	The school building is neat, bright, clean and comfortable	4	11	0	58	28
37.	Staff and students do not view security as an issue in this school	44	36	2	14	4
48.	A positive feeling permeates the school	16	27	14	32	11

B. Clear School Mission

There is a clearly-articulated mission for the school through which the staff shares an understanding of and a commitment to instructional goals, priorities, assessment procedures, and accountability.

Item No.	Statement	Percents of Responses				
		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Strongly Agree
6.	A written statement of purpose that is the driving force behind most important decisions exists in this school	11%	42%	11%	33%	4%
28.	At this school, reteaching and specific skill remediation are important parts of the teaching process	8	14	15	50	14
47.	The results of the High School Proficiency Exam are used to program students into appropriate classes in this school	12	33	28	22	5

C. Instructional Leadership

The principal or department head acts as the instructional leader who effectively communicates the mission of the school to the staff, parents, and students, and who understands and applies the characteristics of instructional effectiveness in the management of the instructional program of the school.

Item No.	Statement	Percents of Responses				
		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Strongly Agree
3.	Most problems facing this school can be solved by the principal and faculty without a great deal of outside help	13%	25%	4%	45%	13%
7.	Teachers in my department consult with my department head about instructional concerns or problems	9	21	9	50	12
10.	The principal is highly visible throughout the school	7	47	6	37	4
14.	The principal is an important instructional resource person in this school	16	40	10	22	12
17.	My department head requires and regularly reviews lesson plans . . .	5	12	9	46	28
20.	Discussions with my department head often result in improved instructional practices	10	22	22	30	16
22.	The principal is very active in securing resources, arranging opportunities and promoting staff development activities for the faculty	13	34	10	31	13
24.	My department head makes several formal classroom observations each year	9	22	14	40	16
26.	The principal is accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction	9	24	11	42	15

(more)

C. Instructional Leadership, Continued

Item No.	Statement	Percents of Responses				
		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Strongly Agree
29.	Teachers in my department meet with our department head regularly to discuss what the department head will observe during classroom observations	10%	29%	21%	29%	11%
31.	The principal rarely makes informal contacts with students and teachers around the school . . .	23	34	12	27	5
35.	Formal observations by my department head are regularly followed by a post-observation conference	6	20	16	37	21
38.	An instructional improvement plan usually results from a post-observation conference with my department head	6	27	26	26	15
39.	There is clear, strong, centralized instructional leadership from the principal in this school	14	28	20	26	12
42.	The principal leads frequent formal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement	9	40	21	24	6

D. High Expectations

The school displays a climate of expectation in which the staff believes and demonstrates that students can attain mastery of basic skills and that they (the staff) have the capability to help students achieve such mastery.

Item No.	Statement	Percents of Responses				
		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Strongly Agree
2.	In this school, low-achieving students present more discipline problems than other students	6%	17%	5%	48%	24%
13.	Most of the present ninth grade students in this school can be expected to complete high school	20	41	12	25	3
18.	Teachers in this school believe they are responsible for all students mastering all basic skills at each grade level	11	37	17	28	6
27.	Low-achieving students usually answer questions as often as other students in my classroom	10	44	19	17	10
32.	Teachers believe that every student in this school can master basic skills as a direct result of the instructional program	6	40	12	28	14

E. Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-On-Task

Teachers allocate a significant amount of classroom time to instruction in basic skill areas. For a high percentage of that allocated time, students are engaged in planned learning activities.

Item No.	Statement	Percents of Responses				
		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Strongly Agree
12.	During basic skills instruction, students are working independently on seatwork for the majority of the allocated time	4%	26%	35%	33%	3%
25.	Class atmosphere in this school is, generally, very conducive to learning for all students	5	27	15	44	9
33.	There are few interruptions during class time	26	28	11	30	5
40.	Teachers in this school plan assignments so that students will be highly successful during the practice work that follows direct instruction	3	11	30	44	13
46.	Daily lessons in this school typically included the following elements: teacher presentation, student practice, specific feedback, evaluation of student performance	3	10	17	57	14

F. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

Feedback on student academic progress is frequently obtained. Multiple assessment methods such as teacher-made tests, samples of students' work, mastery skills checklists, criterion-referenced tests and norm-referenced tests are used. The results of testing are used to improve individual student performance and also to improve the instructional program.

Item No.	Statement	Percents of Responses				
		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Strongly Agree
4.	Criterion-referenced tests are used to assess basic skills throughout the school	4%	21%	32%	39%	5%
11.	There is no systematic, regular assessment of students' basic skills in most classrooms	18	45	16	17	4
19.	Multiple assessment methods are used to assess student progress in basic skills (e.g., criterion-referenced tests, work samples, mastery checklists, etc.)	3	19	23	43	13
41.	Teachers give students specific feedback on daily assignments	4	6	30	51	9
44.	The standardized testing program is an accurate and valid measure of the basic skills curriculum in this school	10	36	22	28	4

G. Home-School Relations

Parents understand and support the basic mission of the school and are made to feel that they have an important role in achieving this mission.

Item No.	Statement	Percents of Responses				
		Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Unde-cided	Agree	Strongly Agree
5.	Most parents would rate this school as superior	17%	54%	9%	16%	4%
15.	Beyond parent conferences and report cards, teachers in this school use several other ways for communicating student progress to parents	3	16	11	58	12
23.	There is an active parent-school group in this school that involves many parents	16	35	11	28	10
30.	Teachers and parents are aware of the homework policy in this school	3	20	6	56	16
36.	Almost all students complete assigned homework before coming to school	38	35	15	9	4
43.	During parent-teacher conferences, there is a focus on student achievement and basic skills mastery	6	6	11	56	20
45.	Parent-teacher conferences result in specific plans for home/school cooperation aimed at improving student classroom achievement	5	34	9	44	8

DS/fc:8/84

APPENDIX B

A. Safe and Orderly Environment

There is an orderly, purposeful atmosphere which is free from the threat of physical harm. However, the atmosphere is not oppressive and is conducive to teaching and learning.

Item No.	Statement	Mean Score Per Year 1983	1984	t-Value	Significance Level
1.	This school is a safe and secure place to work	2.52	2.58	.28	NS
8.	Most students in this school are eager and enthusiastic about learning	2.35	2.42	.41	NS
9.	The physical condition of this school building is, generally, unpleasant and unkempt	3.93	4.21	1.75	NS
16.	Students in this school abide by school rules	2.55	2.86	1.65	NS
21.	Generally, discipline is not an issue in this school	2.09	2.36	1.41	NS
34.	The school building is neat, bright, clean and comfortable	3.87	3.96	.57	NS
37.	Staff and students do not view security as an issue in this school	1.81	1.97	.90	NS
48.	A positive feeling permeates the school	2.86	2.95	.43	NS

B. Clear School Mission

There is a clearly-articulated mission for the school through which the staff shares an understanding of and a commitment to instructional goals, priorities, assessment procedures, and accountability.

Item No.	Statement	Mean Score Per Year 1983	1984	t-Value	Significance Level
6.	A written statement of purpose that is the driving force behind most important decisions exists in this school	2.82	2.75	.34	NS
28.	At this school, reteaching and specific skill remediation are important parts of the teaching process	3.62	3.48	.74	NS
47.	The results of the High School Proficiency Exam are used to program students into appropriate classes in this school	2.64	2.75	.61	NS

C. Instructional Leadership

The principal or department head acts as the instructional leader who effectively communicates the mission of the school to the staff, parents, and students, and who understands and applies the characteristics of instructional effectiveness in the management of the instructional program of the school.

Item No.	Statement	Mean Score Per Year 1983	1984	t-Value	Significance Level
3.	Most problems facing this school can be solved by the principal and faculty without a great deal of outside help	3.05	3.20	.70	NS
7.	Teachers in my department consult with my department head about instructional concerns or problems	3.43	3.36	.36	NS
10.	The principal is highly visible throughout the school	3.14	2.82	1.68	NS
14.	The principal is an important instructional resource person in this school	2.90	2.74	.75	NS
17.	My department head requires and regularly reviews lesson plans	3.86	3.80	.34	NS
20.	Discussions with my department head often result in improved instructional practices	3.41	3.19	1.10	NS
22.	The principal is very active in securing resources, arranging opportunities and promoting staff development activities for the faculty	3.12	2.97	.71	NS
24.	My department head makes several formal classroom observations each year	3.65	3.32	1.77	NS
26.	The principal is accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction	3.40	3.29	.56	NS

(more)

C. Instructional Leadership, Continued

Item No.	Statement	Mean Score Per Year 1983	1984	t-Value	Significance Level
29.	Teachers in my department meet with our department head regularly to discuss what the department head will observe during classroom observations	3.08	3.02	.29	NS
31.	The principal rarely makes informal contacts with students and teachers around the school	3.71	3.43	1.50	NS
35.	Formal observations by my department head are regularly followed by a post-observation conference	3.48	3.46	.09	NS
38.	An instructional improvement plan usually results from a post-observation conference with my department head	3.01	3.16	.80	NS
39.	There is clear, strong, centralized instructional leadership from the principal in this school	2.93	2.95	.08	NS
42.	The principal leads frequent formal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement	2.60	2.78	.94	NS

D. High Expectations

The school displays a climate of expectation in which the staff believes and demonstrates that students can attain mastery of basic skills and that they (the staff) have the capability to help students achieve such mastery.

Item No.	Statement	Mean Score Per Year 1983	1984	t-Value	Significance Level
2.	In this school, low-achieving students present more discipline problems than other students	2.14	2.32	.91	NS
13.	Most of the present ninth grade students in this school can be expected to complete high school	2.28	2.49	1.17	NS
18.	Teachers in this school believe they are responsible for all students mastering all basic skills at each grade level	2.94	2.81	.71	NS
27.	Low-achieving students usually answer questions as often as other students in my classroom	2.41	2.72	1.67	NS
32.	Teachers believe that every student in this school can master basic skills as a direct result of the instructional program	2.93	3.03	.52	NS

E. Opportunity to Learn and Student Time-On-Task

Teachers allocate a significant amount of classroom time to instruction in basic skill areas. For a high percentage of that allocated time, students are engaged in planned learning activities.

Item No.	Statement	Mean Score Per Year 1983	1984	t-Value	Significance Level
12.	During basic skills instruction, students are working independently on seatwork for the majority of the allocated time	3.25	3.03	1.43	NS
25.	Class atmosphere in this school is, generally, very conducive to learning for all students	3.25	3.24	.05	NS
33.	There are few interruptions during class time	2.32	2.60	1.32	NS
40.	Teachers in this school plan assignments so that students will be highly successful during the practice work that follows direct instruction	3.40	3.52	.73	NS
46.	Daily lessons in this school typically include the following elements: teacher presentation, student practice, specific feedback, evaluation of student performance	3.82	3.69	.85	NS

F. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

Feedback on student academic progress is frequently obtained. Multiple assessment methods such as teacher-made tests, samples of students' work, mastery skills checklists, criterion-referenced tests and norm-referenced tests are used. The results of testing are used to improve individual student performance and also to improve the instructional program.

Item No.	Statement	Mean Score Per Year 1983	1984	t-Value	Significance Level
4.	Criterion-referenced tests are used to assess basic skills throughout the school	3.14	3.20	.40	NS
11.	There is no systematic, regular assessment of students' basic skills in most classrooms	3.54	3.57	.18	NS
19.	Multiple assessment methods are used to assess student progress in basic skills (e.g., criterion-referenced tests, work samples, mastery check lists, etc.)	3.50	3.44	.34	NS
41.	Teachers give students specific feedback on daily assignments	3.72	3.55	1.24	NS
44.	The standardized testing program is an accurate and valid measure of the basic skills curriculum in this school	2.78	2.79	.08	NS

G. Home-School Relations

Parents understand and support the basic mission of the school and are made to feel that they have an important role in achieving this mission.

Item No.	Statement	Mean Score Per Year 1983	Mean Score Per Year 1984	t-Value	Significance Level
5.	Most parents would rate this school as superior	2.36	2.34	.14	NS
15.	Beyond parent conferences and report cards, teachers in this school use several other ways for communicating student progress to parents	3.48	3.61	.79	NS
23.	There is an active parent-school group in this school that involves many parents	2.54	2.81	1.37	NS
30.	Teachers and parents are aware of the homework policy in this school	2.86	3.62	4.30	$<.01$
36.	Almost all students complete assigned homework before coming to school	1.89	2.04	.93	NS
43.	During parent-teacher conferences, there is a focus on student achievement and basic skills mastery	3.69	3.77	.45	NS
45.	Parent-teacher conferences result in specific plans for home/school cooperation aimed at improving student classroom achievement	3.09	3.15	.30	NS

DS/fc:8/84